

Claims 1-12, 14-17 and 22-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by "GDSA: An X.500 Directory Implementation Supporting Heterogeneous Databases - 1991" (Leung). Claims 13 and 18-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly obvious from Leung. Applicant has carefully considered the Examiner's comments and the cited art, and respectfully submit independent claims 1, 8, 13, 14, 18 and 22 are patentably over the cited art, for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 relates to a method of arranging data in a database comprising creating a first table adapted for storing the data and having one row for each data entry and creating a second table adapted for storing data components and having one row for each component of the data.

Leung, as understood by Applicant, relates to an X.500 directory implementation supporting heterogeneous databases and simply describes a DIT table and an ENTRY table. The DIT table that holds information of the structure of the DIT with each record containing the system identifier of an object, that of its parent, and its RDN. The ENTRY table simply holds information about each directory object, with each record holding the system identifier of an object, and an attribute type of the object in normalized and raw forms.

However, Applicant finds no teaching or suggestion in the cited art of a first table adapted for storing data and having one row for each data entry and a second table adapted for storing *data components*, still less that the second table has one row for each component of the data, as recited in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant submits independent claim 1 is patentably distinct from the cited art. Independent claim 14 is believed to be patentably distinct from the cited art, for at least similar reasons.

In addition, Applicant finds no teaching or suggestion of a data storage arrangement comprising a search table containing at least one row having a plurality of columns and a subsearch table containing at least one row having a plurality of columns including a component identifier column, as recited in independent claim 8.

Leung, as noted in the Office Action, indicates that the RDNs are coded in such a way that matching them can be done efficiently. However, Leung is not understood to teach or suggest determining a component of a given data entry and executing one of an exact or initial matching on the second table in order to locate the component, as recited in independent claim 22.

The Office Action suggests that Leung teaches or suggests a third table. Applicant submits that this conclusion is only the result of impermissible hindsight. At most, Leung describes the DIT and ENTRY stored as two relational tables.

However, Leung is not understood to teach or suggest a database having a data storage arrangement comprising a first table directed to a hierarchy which defines a relationship between objects and configured to have one row per object, a second table directed to objects which define one or more values within each object and configured to have one row per value, and a third table directed to one or more selected components of values and configured to have one row for each component of each value, as recited in independent claim 13.

Accordingly, Applicant submits independent claim 13 is patentable over the cited art. Independent claim 18 is believed to be patentable over the cited art, for at least similar reasons.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required in connection with this amendment and to credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

If a petition for an extension of time is required to make this response timely, this paper should be considered to be such a petition, and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite fees to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

If a telephone interview could advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Entry of this amendment and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Richard F. Jaworski', is written over a horizontal line.

RICHARD F. JAWORSKI

Reg. No.33,515

Attorney for Applicants

Cooper & Dunham LLP

Tel.: (212) 278-0400